

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(Tehama)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JESSICA NICOLE MORRISON,

Defendant and Appellant.

C087114

(Super. Ct. No. NCR90352)

Appointed counsel for defendant Jessica Nicole Morrison asked this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*)). Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we will affirm the judgment.

## I

Defendant was detained in April 2014 outside a hotel where law enforcement officers were conducting a narcotics investigation. Defendant was found in possession of 4.8 grams of methamphetamine and \$943 in currency. She pleaded guilty to possession of methamphetamine for sale (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378 -- count 2) and admitted other allegations in return for a suspended six-year state prison sentence and a grant of probation. The trial court imposed the agreed sentence.

In September 2017, defendant admitted violating probation by testing positive for methamphetamine on one occasion and failing to appear for drug testing on five other occasions. The next month the trial court reinstated probation.

In January 2018, defendant admitted violating probation by appearing late for drug court and for court reviews. The trial court denied defendant's motion to strike the three-year drug enhancement and imposed the previously suspended six-year sentence, consisting of three years in county jail and three years on mandatory supervision. The trial court awarded defendant 256 days of presentence custody credit (128 actual days and 128 conduct days). It also imposed a \$388 restitution fine (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (b)) and ordered the payment of a previously imposed \$400 suspended probation revocation restitution fine. (Pen. Code, § 1202.44.) In addition, the trial court imposed a \$168 laboratory fee (Health & Saf. Code, § 11372.5, subd. (a)), a \$348 drug program fee (Health & Saf. Code, § 11372.7, subd. (a)), a \$28 court operations assessment (Pen. Code, § 1465.8), and an \$18 conviction assessment (Gov. Code, § 70373).

## II

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and asking this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed and we received no communication from defendant.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

## DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

---

MAURO, J.

We concur:

/S/  
RAYE, P. J.

/S/  
BLEASE, J.